

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

---

TYRONE WILLIAMS,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	Case No. 5:05-cv-84
	)	
v.	)	Honorable David W. McKeague
	)	
INGHAM COUNTY	)	
CIRCUIT COURT et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	

---

**OPINION**

This is an action for writ of mandamus, ostensibly brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1361. The Court has granted Petitioner leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and Petitioner has been directed to pay the initial partial filing fee when funds become available. Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, PUB. L. NO. 104-134, 110 STAT. 1321 (1996) (“PLRA”), the Court is required to dismiss any prisoner action brought under federal law if the complaint is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2), 1915A. The Court must read Petitioner’s *pro se* complaint indulgently, *see Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), and accept Petitioner’s allegations as true, unless they are clearly irrational or wholly incredible. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992). Applying these standards, the Court will dismiss Petitioner’s complaint as frivolous.

## **Discussion**

### **I. Factual Allegations**

Petitioner Tyrone Williams presently is incarcerated with the Michigan Department of Corrections and housed at the Ionia Maximum Correctional Facility. He sues the Ingham County Circuit Court and Circuit Court Judge William E. Collette. The gravamen of Petitioner's complaint is that Respondents, by refusing to waive the state-court filing fee or partial filing fee, denied Petitioner his rights of access to the courts and due process and violated clear state law, MICH. COMP. LAWS § 600.2963(7). Petitioner seeks a writ of mandamus compelling the Ingham County Circuit Court to waive or suspend the initial partial filing fee and process his state-court civil complaint for declaratory judgment.

### **II. Frivolous**

An action may be dismissed as frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Lawler v. Marshall*, 898 F.2d 1196, 1198 (6th Cir.1990). Claims that lack an arguable or rational basis in law include claims for which the defendants are clearly entitled to immunity and claims of infringement of a legal interest which clearly does not exist; claims that lack an arguable or rational basis in fact describe fantastic or delusional scenarios. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327-28; *Lawler*, 898 F.2d at 1199.

Petitioner's action is legally frivolous. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1361, the district courts "have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff." In the instant case, Petitioner seeks a writ of mandamus to compel a state court and state-court judge to perform

their duties. By its terms, § 1361 does not grant authority to this Court to compel state courts to perform their duties.

Moreover, a federal district court is without jurisdiction to review the actions of the state courts. The federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, and Petitioner has the burden of proving the Court's jurisdiction. *United States v. Horizon Healthcare*, 160 F.3d 326, 329 (6th Cir. 1998). Even where subject matter jurisdiction is not raised by the parties, the Court must consider the issue *sua sponte*. See *City of Kenosha v. Bruno*, 412 U.S. 507, 511 (1973); *Norris v. Schotten*, 146 F.3d 314, 324 (6th Cir. 1998); *Mickler v. Nimishillen & Tuscarawas Ry. Co.*, 13 F.3d 184, 189 (6th Cir. 1993).

A federal district court has no authority to review final judgments of state court judicial proceedings. *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983); *Gottfried v. Med. Planning Servs., Inc.*, 142 F.3d 326, 330 (6th Cir.1998). Even constitutional claims which are inextricably intertwined with the state court decisions are not reviewable. *Feldman*, 460 U.S. at 483 n.16; *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923); *Patmon v. Michigan Supreme Court*, 224 F.3d 504, 509-10 (6th Cir. 2000); *United States v. Owens*, 54 F.3d 271, 274 (6th Cir. 1995). A federal claim is inextricably intertwined with the state-court judgment “‘if the federal claim succeeds only to the extent that the state court wrongly decided the issues before it. Where federal relief can only be predicated upon a conviction that the state court was wrong, it is difficult to conceive the federal proceeding as, in substance, anything other than a prohibited appeal of the state-court judgment.’” *Peterson Novelties, Inc. v. City of Berkley*, 305 F.3d 386, 391 (6th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Catz v. Chalker*, 142 F.3d 279, 293 (6th Cir.1998)) (other internal citations omitted); see also *Johnson v. De Grandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1005-06 (1994) (under the *Rooker-*

*Feldman* doctrine, “a party losing in state court is barred from seeking what in substance would be appellate review of the state judgment in a United States district court, based on the losing party’s claim that the state judgment itself violates the loser’s federal rights.”); *Tropf v. Fid. Nat’l Title Ins. Co.*, 289 F.3d 929, 937 (6th Cir. 2002); *Anderson v. Charter Township of Ypsilanti*, 266 F.3d 487, 492-93 (6th Cir. 2001); *Patmon*, 224 F.3d at 506-07. A party who loses in state court and then sues in federal court is asserting injury at the hands of the state court and his federal suit is making an impermissible attempt to obtain federal collateral review. *Garry v. Gels*, 82 F.3d 1362, 1367-68 (7th Cir.1996); *Stewart v. Fleet Financial Group*, No. 96-2146, 129 F.3d 1265, 1997 WL 705219, \*1 (6th Cir. Nov. 4, 1997).

Petitioner’s claims are “inextricably intertwined” with decisions of the state courts because they amount to nothing more nor less than a “prohibited appeal” from the decisions of the Michigan state courts. *Peterson Novelties*, 305 F.3d at 390. The recourse available to Petitioner in response to adverse state-court decisions was to pursue timely appeals in the Michigan Court of Appeals, thereafter seek leave to appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court, and if necessary apply for a writ of *certiorari* to the United States Supreme Court. *Gottfried*, 142 F.3d at 330 (“[L]ower federal courts do not have jurisdiction to review a case litigated and decided in state court; only the United States Supreme Court has jurisdiction to correct state court judgments.”).

Because the *Rooker - Feldman* doctrine clearly precludes a lower federal court from reviewing state-law decisions, Petitioner’s case is dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. A claim dismissed the basis of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine is legally frivolous and constitutes a dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). See *Alpern v. Lieb*, 38 F.3d 933, 934 (7th Cir. 1994); *Parker v. Phillips*, No. 01-5325, 2001 WL 1450704 (6th Cir. 2001)

(holding action to be frivolous under § 1915(g) where one ground for dismissal is *Rooker-Feldman*); *Carlock v. Williams*, No. 98-5545, 1999 WL 454880 (6th Cir. June 22, 1999) (same).

### **Conclusion**

Having conducted the review now required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act, the Court determines that Petitioner's action fails to state a claim and will therefore be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b).

The Court must next decide whether an appeal of this action would be in good faith within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). *See McGore v. Wigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997). For the same reasons that the Court dismisses the action, the Court discerns no good-faith basis for an appeal. Should Petitioner appeal this decision, the Court will assess the \$255 appellate filing fee pursuant to § 1915(b)(1), *see McGore*, 114 F.3d at 610-11, unless Petitioner is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis*, e.g., by the "three-strikes" rule of § 1915(g). If he is barred, he will be required to pay the \$255 appellate filing fee in one lump sum.

This is a dismissal as described by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

A Judgment consistent with this Opinion will be entered.

Dated: May 31, 2005

/s/ David W. McKeague  
David W. McKeague  
United States District Judge